



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the determinant and its adjoint, without any reference to the constructed figure. There is therefore nothing empirical about this method.

C. PLANCK.

HAYWARD'S HEATH, ENGLAND.

### BJÖERKLUND'S "DEATH AND RESURRECTION."

The résumé and discussion of the above book\* with reference to and contrast with the writings and position of Dr. Carus, by Mr. J. E. Fries in *The Monist*, April issue, is deeply interesting. The book itself is absorbingly so, evidencing large knowledge in research and much independent thinking. It may not be conceded, however, as convincing in establishment of the thesis in theory—the soul as a thing or matter of the cells. The author's discussion scarce touches the soul, stopping short of the thing in pursuit, but with an incompetent substitute. Cells are given individual but not *independent* existence, and on that ground alone the cell is incompetent as basic to the soul.

Mr. Fries begins with the "life-force," and the Editor's earlier published article "Life and the Soul," and the point in antagonism with Dr. Carus is emphasized that "life has no roots whatever in the material world." Surely "a strange statement" this! Dr. Carus is quoted as follows: "Living bodies consist of the very same materials of which the rest of the world is composed," which physics and chemistry make certain. The "life phenomenon is *sui generis*"; this, too, science concedes. Again "...life is a manifestation of energy which forms a category of its own" etc., a not pronounced materialism this, surely. Here, then, is life-force *sui generis* yet natural, no mysticism or supernaturalism involved or required.

To the somewhat equivocal question, "With no other resources than the material world to fall back upon, how then did life grow out of matter and physical energy?" it is answered: "Surely we must look beyond the boundaries of the visible world." To this it may be replied: Energy is not of category with matter and the visible. Within the cosmic world, however, are found both matter and energy, and whatever other factor may be essential to the "origin and substance of life." The cosmical is the natural, and

\* *Death and Resurrection from the Point of View of the Cell-Theory* by Gustaf Björklund. Translated from the Swedish by J. E. Fries. Chicago, Open Court Pub. Co., 1910.

with no necessary supernaturalism, in factor or fact. Science is leading to the monism of but *one* energy or force in the universe—varied in form or manifestation. To pit the psychic or spiritual against the material, with kinds of force in consonance, involves in confusion, and a divided house that cannot stand.

Soul and life, consciousness and energy are not synonymous or correlative. But neither is soul nor consciousness nor thought without energy. Kant's *pure* and *transcendent* are simply categories of degree, not kind. All reason is reasoning, all sentiment is sentimental, be it angelic or devilish.

It follows, then, that there is no need to go outside the cosmical world to find the roots or elements of life, or the source and origin of all that is possible to thought manipulation. Life, and the human soul and mind are the most natural of things, and the supernatural, at least in the banal sense it has acquired, may be dispensed with and no loss felt.

Mr. Fries quotes from the book: "...all organic matter is a product of art, that is, a product which the forces of nature cannot spontaneously produce... a foreign interference is necessary." Now, it is certain that there are no other than the forces of nature to effect these products. As certain also is there the psychic or *art* factor in the effecting of the organic matter. But this psychic or *art* factor is *not* a *living will*, or, as later on designated, soul, as the author should himself have seen. He says: "Will and physical forces then stand against each other as two fundamentally and radically different causes. A will may neglect to do what it ought to, may be idle, industrious, undecided; a physical force cannot leave undone what it has to do, can never be called idle, industrious or undecided." To be sure that is so. Such a "will," therefore, cannot be in organic connection with a physiological or living thing, because it achieves its end as an organism harmoniously, and completely in and of itself. No factor of the physiological organism *stands against* any other factor in their entire *ensemble*, as such *organization* is regal here. The *end*, purposed in the organic is not present to the organism in the *form of idea* (W. R. Sorley). There is no *soul*, no *living will* in the physiological; notwithstanding there is the psychic or art factor, *objective* with all other factors of the organism as such, or in its primalism. This objective psychic or art factor is a qualitative property or power of life-force and may well constitute it *special*, having this specific manifestation. Being of and with the life energy, it is ubiquitous as the cell and initiates the directivity to the func-

tional intracellularly—as evidenced by all physiology, plant or animal.

Björklund's error is simple enough in his premises, and he has a *soul* in every cell—his explaining away a multitude of souls is quite inconclusive. His error is in not seeing that life-force, *sui generis* as it is, is simply the physical energy—he is pleased to term it—in directivity by complexing of the psychic or *art* factor, which he interprets as *soul*, and Sir Oliver Lodge, equally mistaken, designates the “formative principle of the organism.”

Life-force, without *soul*, or *living will*, is competent to the whole of the physiological as a phenomenon. Possibly *feelings*, correctly interpreted, but certainly not *sentiments* and *thoughts* are the manifestations of life-force. Life-force as embodied in living matter in germ status of every grade, is fully competent to the whole of the physiological of its grade, but of *nothing beyond*. The “foreign interference” of the author, correctly conceived and stated, is a *new departure in the evolutionary*. The origin of life marked an epoch in cosmic evolution. The advent or coming into entity of the human soul was another “foreign interference” equally epochal evolutionally. This was attained by the complexing of the physiological with a psychism *subjective* in status and rôle. Initial and basic in the concept of soul and mind is this *subjectivity*. The physiological is wholly *objective*—contingency and the stereotyped obtain, directed by the psychic factor which is a *constituent of the organism*. The fact of the *go* of the physiological is the hint of the soul and mind, yet there is no *soul* or *living will*, because all is *objective*. Let the mind sweep through all the vault of the cosmos, and but a single subjective factor or phenomenon is found—*man*, the human soul, a living will. He is *subjective*; he does things; mind is creative. The soul or mind is distinct in concept and in essence, in being, from the physiological. In non-connection, yet in vital and organized relation and association with, and in evolution by means of the organization effective in the physiological. The cell provides for, is effective in, development of body and brain; but soul and mind are not of the cell or brain. Soul, a psychism in subjectivity has basis in immediacy with the functional. The theory and discussion of it in *Death and Resurrection* must be reconsidered and reconstructed to be in consonance with the facts, and so to be of “any special value to religious or emotional life” (Carus).

JOSEPH CLEMENTS, M. D.

WICHITA, KANSAS.